

**FLOOD CONTROL ADVISORY BOARD  
MINUTES**

January 22, 2003

Chairman Melvin Martin called the monthly meeting of the Flood Control Advisory Board to order at 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday, January 22, 2003.

**Board Members Present:** Melvin Martin, Chairman; Scott Ward, Secretary; Kent Cooper; Hasan Mushtaq (for Tom Callow), Ex Officio; Tom Sands (for Paul Cherrington), Ex Officio.

**Board Members Absent:** Shirley Long, Vice Chairman; Paul Cherrington, Ex Officio; Tom Callow, Ex Officio; and Hemant Patel.

**Staff Members Present:** Mike Ellegood, Chief Engineer and General Manager; Julie Lemmon, General Counsel; Dick Perreault, CIP/Policy Manager; Tim Phillips, Deputy Chief Engineer and General Manager; Don Rerick, Project Management Branch Manager; Valerie Swick, Project Manager, Planning and Project Management; Russ Miracle, Division Manager, Planning and Project Management; Tim Murphy, Branch Manager Flood Delineation; Michael Alexander, Management Analyst; Linda Reinbold, Administrative Coordinator; Alicia Robertson, Clerk of the FCAB.

**Guests Present:** Doug C. Nelson, Woolsey Flood Protection District; Burke Lokey, PBS&J; Brian Fry, Dibble and Associates; Jeannette Fish, MCFB; Burton Charron, City of Peoria; Jamie Erickson, HDR; Ed Fritz, MCDOT; Kofi Awumah, Prestige Engineering; Kevin Kummerzell, MWH; and Jeff Minch, DMJM & Harris.

1) FCD EMPLOYEE OF THE QUARTER

Tom LaMarche, Information Technology Division Manager introduced Jim Smith as Employee of the Quarter. Congratulations to Jim.

2) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF DECEMBER 4, 2002

ACTION: It was moved by Mr. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Ward to approve the minutes as submitted. The motion carried unanimously.

3) NEW RIVER CHANNEL – GRAND AVENUE TO SKUNK CREEK AND INCLUDING PARADISE SHORES; IGA

Don Rerick, Project Manager presented IGA FCD2002A010 for the New River Channel – Grand Avenue to Skunk Creek and including Paradise Shores. Don gave an overview of the location of the project. Don reminded everyone that this is the only remaining channel improvement to be completed along New River associated with USACE “Phoenix, Arizona, and Vicinity, including New River” projects. There are several benefits to this project, including the complete channelization of New River that is compatible with the USACE and other District channelization projects. This project also completes SPF protection downstream of the New River – Skunk Creek confluence, and 100-year protection upstream of the confluence to Bell Road. Properties will be removed from the floodplain along this particular reach of New River and this will complete one of the City of Peoria’s highest priority flood control projects.

The District is the lead agency for design, rights-of-way acquisitions and utility relocations. An equal 50/50 cost share between the District and the City of Peoria for the design, rights-of-way acquisitions and utility relocations has been established. The District will also be the lead agency for development of a future IGA for construction.

Discussion:

*Ward:* I’m very curious to hear there is an ability to auction some land. Can we take advantage of this opportunity as part of the IGA and zone and plat this land, then use some of the District resources to enhance the value?

*Rerick:* Typically that is done at the completion of the project with any excess property. Mike Wilson’s Lands Division would be responsible to auction it off. Your question pertaining to enhancement through zoning and planning changes I cannot answer.

*Perreault:* To date we have not considered doing this with this parcel. It is only 10 or 12 acres; it is not a large parcel. However, it may have some potential that we could look into.

*Ward:* Anytime we have land like this I would like to have it brought up for discussion. We have a pretty experienced development team that sits on the FCAB. When we take excess land out of the floodplain area and create some nice corridors with the channelization you do, we can go ahead and plat the lots similar to what was done with the EMF modifications. This could be an outstanding 12-acre apartment site up against the drainage channel. Just be cognizant of that if you will, before you auction the excess land off and someone else takes advantage of it. Looking at our budget issues and how we can use the money lets look at how we can be entrepreneurs and create value.

*Ellegood:* That is an excellent suggestion and I would like the record to reflect that when we have excess property for sale we could bring it up before the FCAB perhaps as an agenda item. It can then be reviewed and the wisdom of the Board can be used to enhance projects. I am not certain how much property is there but certainly we are very sensitive to the fact that we want to maximize the value of that property.

*Martin:* Where is Peoria Avenue on the map you were showing?

*Rerick:* Peoria is one mile south of Cactus; it is off the map to the south.

*Martin:* Did Paradise Shores give the City of Peoria money to stabilize the bank protection when they put their subdivision in?

*Rerick:* To my knowledge the City of Peoria and the developer did not have any relationship at the time. The developer did not own the land where the bank protection is needed. At the time, based on the modeling that was available, it was not in a flood hazard area. The remodeling to the Middle New River Watercourse Master Plan (WCMP) has identified that they are now in a flood hazard area and require the bank protection. We have Burton Charron with the City of Peoria here who may be able to answer some of your questions.

*Charron:* Paradise Shores actually put in a flood cut off wall at their eastern property limit. At the time the property owner that protected them from the bank was not interested in doing bank

improvements for their benefit. The property was extensive and he was an all or nothing purchase and they were not interested in purchasing the approximately 12 acres, just for the 800 feet they needed. They actually built a flood cut off wall and they were the first out there. Subsequently, all the improvements have been made.

*Martin:* This bank protection is already in?

*Charron:* They did just a cut off wall; they excavated, constructed a concrete wall and buried it back so that you cannot see it from the surface. The problem is that it is not consistent with the bank up and downstream. The bank is approximately 50 to 100 feet in front of the cut off wall.

*Martin:* Is this project going to be in front of that wall?

*Rerick:* This project will continue the armoring that is both upstream and downstream of this reach and make it continuous to meet the present model hydrology requirements. It will contain the breakout and provide the scour protection and contain the 100-year flows.

*Martin:* How can it be in the floodplain now and before it was not?

*Rerick:* The modeling has changed, the Middle New River (WCMP) identified the change in hydrology and we found the modeling showed some minor breakouts at that location. This is the recommendation we have proceeded on to complete the 800 feet of armoring to have consistent armoring and bank protection from Bell Road to the confluence with Skunk Creek.

*Martin:* Did we buy that property?

*Charron:* The property that is protected is part of the Paradise Shores subdivision. The City was granted a tract adjacent to the river for open space and for the cut off wall. East of the cut off wall to the actual bank of the river was another property owner that was not developing.

*Martin:* Does that property owner still own it now?

*Charron:* Yes, but it is undevelopable. It is narrow to the extent that you could not put a lot depth on that portion of property from the cut off wall.

*Ward:* How is the financial situation of the City of Peoria?

*Charron:* It is sound enough to support this project. Actually through FY 2004 we have had no change to our capital or operating programs.

*Ward:* Have you talked about the sensitivity of New River through there from an environmental standpoint?

*Charron:* The Middle New River WCMP would have established those types of benchmarks and value lines. Our intention is to abide by the WCMP in regards to environmental considerations and recreational considerations.

*Ward:* I hate to see these areas become very channelized and modernized. This is an interesting area, you've got rapid growth of Peoria and you have Sun City just on the other side. If you look at what was done with Indian Bend Wash, that has been modernized but there might be a way you can do some channelization and leave the natural environment the way it is.

*Charron:* At the confluence of Skunk Creek and New River immediately upstream where Loop 101 is to the Sports Complex, there is a riparian area in the channel. Secondly, the City of Peoria is building our first community park north of Thunderbird Road, in the corridor of the freeway. The community park is on the bank, we have plans and later phases to link trails along Skunk Creek and New River. I am not sure how much further we will expand to using the river bottom for recreation facilities, but it is likely to occur there as well.

*Ellegood:* I echo your sentiments exactly with respect to how we manage our watercourses in the County. Unfortunately in this case there has been a hodge-podge over the years of various forms of flood protection. There really needs to be along a watercourse a consistent strategy compatible with one another. One of the key purposes to this project is to make this consistent. In addition, when we are in the final design phase of the project we will recognize the need to preserve open space and habitat.

*Rerick:* As part of our design process the 404 permitting process will be exercised and we will include input from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Our environmental planner is already aware and looking into that aspect of the project. What I think we will have is a very successful

project that will include habitat benefits. The river has naturally revegetated itself, near the confluence. The waters consistently flow and I think we will be able to extend that condition downstream.

**ACTION:** It was moved by Mr. Mushtaq and seconded by Mr. Cooper to approve the staff recommendation. The motion carried unanimously.

4) **WHITE TANKS FRS #3 NORTH INLET CHANNEL**

Valerie Swick, Project Manager, presented Resolution FCD2002R019, for the White Tanks FRS #3 North Inlet Channel. Valerie gave a brief overview of the study, which identifies flooding problems in the western Phoenix metropolitan area and recommended solutions to the problems. The study provided development alternatives to further refine how to collect all the breakout flows. A 2-mile long earthen flood control channel from just north of Olive Avenue to approximately Glendale Avenue was recommended. Under existing conditions, the Beardsley Canal and area east of the Beardsley Canal experience flooding hazards caused by the present flow conditions. The improvements will reduce the flooding hazards and reduce the limits of the existing FEMA floodplain and recently identified flooding hazards by approximately 320 acres, and will provide 100-year flood protection for future improvements and for approximately 109 existing homes east of the Beardsley Canal.

The estimated cost for the project to include design, rights-of-way acquisition, construction and construction management is \$4,000,000 dollars, which is proposed to be cost shared equally between the District and the Maricopa Water District #1 (MWD). The property owners will provide operations and maintenance. The culverts' operations and maintenance will be negotiated with MCDOT.

**Discussion:**

*Mushtaq:* You showed in one of the exhibits that a portion of the floodplain would remain even after the project goes in. How much more would it take to eliminate the entire floodplain if you upgrade the project elements?

*Swick:* You could not upgrade the project. The proposed floodplain is due to the runoff being generated from east of the Beardsley canal in the area. It would be very difficult to get rid of it. When MWD looks to develop the property, they can do what they want to incorporate the floodplain. Because the area is so flat within this piece of land, runoff has a tendency to spread out.

*Martin:* Did you say that the District owns some property there?

*Swick:* Yes, there is a wash that is on the west side of Beardsley Canal, south of Northern Avenue.

**ACTION:** It was moved by Mr. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Cherrington to approve the staff recommendation. The motion carried unanimously.

**Introduction:**

Mike Ellegood introduced agenda items 5, 6, 7 and 8, which are all part of the FY 03/04 Budget. Mike shared the Budget Certification and Reserves Internal Audit findings with the FCAB. The District is required by ARS § 48-3620 to annually certify to the County Board of Supervisors the amount of tax levy on taxable real property that the District considers necessary to: 1) pay

expenses to administer the District's operations, 2) maintain and operate the flood control system, and 3) perform regulatory functions and any of the objects and purposes of common benefit.

Mr. Ellegood gave each of the members of the FCAB a copy of the audit summary. This process is mandated and does not track exactly with the way the County puts the budget together. Every year we get budget guidance and are directed to put a budget together according to this guidance, which is different than what the statute says we are supposed to do. This year our budget guidance from the County's Office of Management and Budget (OMB) was to prepare a budget keeping the operating cost the same as the previous year. In addition we were directed to prepare two additional budgets, one showing a 5% reduction in our operating budget and one showing a 10% reduction. Four budgets were prepared, one reflecting what we believe our "needs" to be. This is the budget we will certify to our Board of Directors. The next one reflecting the OMB budget's guidance, the third one being budget guidance less 5% and the fourth being budget guidance less 10%.

The budgets that you will be seeing today and that we will ask you to approve are budgets based on what we believe our needs to be, it is the "Needs Budget" and it is the highest of the four. It will, to the best of our estimation, not require that the secondary tax levy be raised. It will increase the revenue that the current tax levy rate generates from \$45 million dollars to about \$47 million dollars. This reflects what was told to the BOS in December at the Joint Board Meeting.

5) FY 03/04 - 07/08 FIVE-YEAR CIP

Dick Perreault, CIP Manager, presented the FY 03/04 - 07/08 Five-Year CIP. The CIP budget is the same budget for all four budget scenarios; Needs Budget, OMB Target, Target less 5% and Target less 10%. This budget is a strong continuation of our current year's five-year CIP. Many of the projects that are being worked on this year continue into next year. Spending this year is about 46% of the budget on construction and next year will be around the 56% to 58% range. Next year the CIP Project Reserve is basically non-existent. This year the reserve is a few million dollars, next year it will be less than \$300,000. The available budget is being squeezed into defined activities, which leaves little project reserve. There will not be much of an opportunity for projects to be inserted into the CIP during the next year. Major projects will be worked on next year.

Discussion:

*Martin:* This tax rate is where we are at now?

*Ellegood:* The current tax rate is \$.2119, down from \$.34+ in 1997.

*Martin:* Last year was how much?

*Perreault:* \$.2319 was last year's (FY 01/02) tax rate.

*Ward:* We have talked about the dam safety program, do we have enough reserve in case there is a problem with one of the dams?

*Perreault:* We have in our District carry over each year a certain amount of money that is set aside for repairs or unforeseen damages to our structures. One of the findings of the Internal Audit recently completed was that we have insufficient reserves. One of the things we will be doing over the next couple of years is increasing our District fund balance each year to account for the potential of one of the structures needing major repair.

*Ward:* Is this something we should bring up to the Board of Supervisors?

*Ellegood:* Yes, the need for a reserve is important but needs to be in the context of our overall budget. Where I would ask for support from the FCAB is to approve the budget that we are showing you today and to encourage the approval of this budget by the BOD. This budget

includes in it an annual increase in the carry over which we believe should be sufficient to handle the most unforeseen circumstances. If we have a major catastrophic event, then the CIP stops and we put money into the event. The Auditor asked several District staff members our opinion as to what we think the reserve should be. Our carry over every year needs to be about \$12 million dollars just for operating cost through the first quarter. We believe it should be closer to \$20 million dollars, the remaining \$8 million dollars as a contingency. When you see the budget presentation coming up you will see that carry over this year is expected to be about \$21 million dollars. I think the contingency money is there, but we need the overall budget approved.

*Ward:* What is our percentage now of cash input from client cities, looking at all of our projects and knowing that we would like to be 50/50?

*Perreault:* For the CIP, we are running in the low 30% range. It varies from year to year depending on how we address the payments in the intergovernmental agreements. In some cases we get a certain percentage at the beginning of design or the beginning of construction. It is difficult to say how much it is year to year, but just taking a simple fraction of the revenues we get for CIP projects versus what we are spending is about 30% to 32% right now. It has held fairly steady the last few years.

*Martin:* Did the pie chart show the reserve very small in your budget?

*Perreault:* Within the CIP, we actually have a line item called "Project Reserve" which means monies authorized within the CIP budget, but are not defined or tied to a specific project. Normally we try to keep it to 3% to 5% of the total budget. This year we were aiming for a CIP of \$54 million dollars. When all of the defined projects were backed out we ended up with about \$262,000 dollars remaining. This is a very small project reserve and what this provides within the CIP is if we have cost overruns on land, design or construction, we would have to dip into the project reserve. Luckily because of the economy the last six months we have seen construction contracts coming under our forecast. This money goes off the project budget line and into the project reserve line. It is a little scary to start the year off with this small of a reserve but we are hopeful we will get a couple of good construction bids and we will be able to build the reserve back up.

*Ward:* For being in the flood control business that looks like a low reserve and now we are hearing predictions that in the next 3 to 5 years we are going to get hit with huge rains because of changes in the weather pattern. This is my concern.

*Perreault:* This project reserve is the project reserve within the CIP, this is not the reserve within the District. We have other dollars that are not part of the CIP and they are included in the District's reserve.

*Martin:* I think that is where the confusion is.

**ACTION:** It was moved by Mr. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Mushtaq to approve the staff recommendation. The motion carried unanimously.

## 6) FISCAL YEAR 03/04 PLANNING PROGRAM

Russ Miracle, PPM Division Manager, presented the FY 03/04 Planning Program, Resolution FCD2003R001. The District is required to survey and report existing flood control problems and develop a comprehensive plan to mitigate the existing flood control problems. The proposed FY 03/04 Planning Program will continue seven studies initiated during FY 02/03. Five of which are Master Plan Studies and two are Watercourse Master Plans. The proposed Planning Program for FY 03/04 also includes two Master Plans and one new Watercourse Master Plan. Continuation of the existing Structures Multi-use and Aesthetic Evaluation Project for evaluation of existing structures and Candidate Assessment Reports to develop information for candidate projects to the District's CIP is also included in the proposed Planning Program.

Discussion:

*Martin:* Why should we spend taxpayer money identifying ways to help sand and gravel companies in their business?

*Miracle:* What we have found is that we can expect the sand and gravel operators to evaluate their site and any adverse impacts it might have. What we are proposing to do is to look at the entire reach of the river and cumulative impacts, considering not just their development but also, other uses in the future. We are looking at a much bigger picture than we would expect the sand and gravel companies to.

*Martin:* Will you be using aerial photography?

*Miracle:* No, we already have aerial photography completed for that area, we will move into the study using the topographical mapping we have available.

*Ward:* It helps the development community when the District is able to come in and say, this is in a floodplain, and we are studying this area. It would make it so much easier if there was a topographical map of the county. I support this from the development standpoint.

**ACTION:** It was moved by Mr. Ward and seconded by Mr. Cooper to approve the staff recommendation. The motion carried unanimously.

7) FISCAL YEAR 03/04 FLOODPLAIN DELINEATION PROGRAM

Tim Murphy, Floodplain Delineation Branch Manager, presented the FY 03/04 Floodplain Delineation Program. State and federal law mandates that either the District or private development must identify floodplains in order to maintain the County's or a community's good standing with the National Flood Insurance Program. Floodplain delineation studies are technical assessments to quantify and qualify areas of potential flooding. The public is assured of continuity and consistency of the floodplain regardless of political boundaries by having the District do floodplain studies. Continuing this program allows for sound floodplain management so that future development will not impede, divert or retard the conveyance of floodwaters to the detriment of others and to reduce the flood damage potential for current and future development, while maintaining the County's good standing within the National Flood Insurance Program. The two floodplain studies to be started in FY 03/04 are the Upper New River Watershed Zone A Delineations and the Lower Centennial Watershed #2 Zone A Delineations.

Discussion:

*Cherrington:* Are the miles of delineations linear miles or square miles?

*Murphy:* They are linear miles.

**ACTION:** It was moved by Mr. Cooper and seconded by Mr. Mushtaq to approve the staff recommendation. The motion carried unanimously.

8) FISCAL YEAR 03/04 FLOOD CONTROL DISTRICT BUDGET

Michael Alexander, Management Analyst, presented the FY 03/04 Flood Control District Budget. District staff was asked to submit the Operations Budget considering four different scenarios: Need, OMB Target, OMB Target -5%, and OMB Target -10%. Mike presented several revenue and expense budget assumptions to the FCAB. The Needs Budget was explained and then compared to the other three scenarios. The BOD will approve the tentative budget at its May 19

meeting. Final approval of the FY 03/04 Budget will be at the BOD's June 23 meeting and the tax rate is scheduled to be set by the BOS at the August 18, 2003 meeting.

Discussion:

*Martin:* Why does the cost of operations go down?

*Ellegood:* Assumptions are important to remember when looking at the tax revenue. Mike's assumption of the secondary (flood control) tax rate is no change. If it does change then clearly the revenue side of the ledger will change accordingly. If the revenue does not change we spend less and it goes into fund balance, which is carried over to the end.

*Martin:* How sure are we of the Drainage Administration moving to Planning and Development?

*Ellegood:* The issue of the Drainage Administration moving still has not been resolved, although we have made very strong arguments that it needs to remain with the District. In the process of examining the issues we have identified a need for better cost accounting.

*Martin:* If Drainage gets dropped out of the budget how much are we talking about?

*Alexander:* About \$2 million dollars.

*Ellegood:* My best estimate, based on data I've seen, is that it will be about 2/3 drainage and about 1/3 floodplain. We would retain about \$700,000 dollars and give up about \$1.3 million dollars.

*Martin:* The attorney fees are \$270,000. Why don't we hire an attorney to be here all the time?

*Ellegood:* Most of our legal services come from the County Attorney's Office. The attorneys specialize in particular issues, Julie Lemmon is a generalist and also handles the flood control and water use issues. We find that this expertise is very valuable. When we get an actual litigation it really ties people up.

*Martin:* How many vehicles are you planning to replace this year?

*Alexander:* I believe it is 15.

*Cooper:* Do you have concerns about what the County Administration agenda is for this year?

*Ellegood:* I think everybody including all of the cities are waiting for the shoe to fall from the state legislature. Until that happens, I don't think there is a clear defining plan. Our strategy is to keep what we have got and keep our programs going and try to get through this. I suspect this is what the County's plan is as well.

**ACTION:** It was moved by Mr. Sands and seconded by Mr. Cooper to approve the staff recommendation. The motion carried unanimously.

Discussion:

*Ellegood:* I will be preparing a letter for three signatures: Chairman Martin; Joe Young, Chief Financial Office; and mine to certify our Needs Budget to the BOS.

9) **COMMENTS FROM THE CHIEF ENGINEER AND GENERAL MANAGER**

Mr. Ellegood began by stating the Drainage issue is still unresolved, meetings are set up and for some reason they get postponed. The issue is in limbo, the five positions you saw in one of the budgets are still out there and have been for a year. The District is continuing to work through the issue.

Mr. Ellegood explained to the FCAB that one of the findings, as a result of our Internal Audit, found that we were not enforcing some of the sand and gravel regulations as rigorously as we should be. A very small group of people within the District involved in reviewing mining operations has been set up. The effort is being lead by David Boggs. Many of you have met Dave, he is a very well qualified Professional Engineer, he is a PhD, and he understands sediment



transport and other issues associated with sand and gravel. Dave has dealt with many elected and appointed officials at high levels in the State Department. Tom Wergen is assisting him, and jointly these two will be able to bring our mining operations review activities into compliance with both statute and the Auditor's recommendations.

Mr. Ellegood continued with the announcement of John Hathaway to replace Dave Boggs in Drainage. He is a very capable individual, John used to have his own consulting engineering firm, and he is a Professional Engineer. This move leaves the Drainage Review Team a little short handed. A contract or help from the Engineering Division will augment the Drainage Review Team temporarily.

This Friday is the District Annual Retreat. Mr. Ellegood explained the details of taking a very broad cross section of the District staff to talk about a number of issues that face the District. Team building exercises will be performed as well as other activities.

Mr. Ellegood has established five objectives for the District, which he will be talking about at the Annual Retreat as well as throughout the year:

1. Become a Cooperating Technical Community with FEMA this year. This will ultimately allow the District to generate flood maps locally. This will save a lot of time and will be a better service to the development community and the citizens at large in Maricopa County.
2. The District is among the top 1% of the Nation in the CRS program. Mr. Ellegood's goal is to increase our current standing by 500 points this year.
3. To greatly improve and make common the District Cost Accounting System. There are currently good systems in the Engineering Division and the Project Management Division. Some of the others are not quite as good. Mr. Ellegood's goal is to bring all Divisions together with a common Cost Accounting System.
4. The District is experiencing another year without raises or any financial recognition for our employees. Mr. Ellegood is concerned about employee morale over this extended period of financial drought. Mr. Ellegood is going to work with the Management Team to assure that managers work with employees closely to keep morale where it needs to be.
5. A major challenge facing the District is the aging of the Management Team. Mr. Ellegood stressed the need for developing the next generation of District leaders.

A keynote speaker will also be present for the Annual Retreat. Mike Hutchinson, City Manager for the City of Mesa will speak about customer service, the District's performance and the importance of the District in his community.

#### 10) SUMMARY OF RECENT ACTIONS

Actions of the Board of Supervisors were included in the FCAB packet.

#### 11) OTHER BUSINESS AND COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC

##### Other Business:

Julie Lemmon informed the FCAB of a lawsuit served to the District on the Agua Fria River by a development company in the area north of Grand Avenue. It is a multi section complaint. The other party is Vulcan Materials. Ms. Lemmon will be providing the FCAB with more information.

*Cooper:* When we met with the BOS at the Joint Board Meeting in December, Shirley Long brought up a question of, isn't there a way of capturing storm water and using it for recharge purposes. The District's response was that there is not money for recharge nor is it your responsibility. It seems to me that the Ground Water Replenishing District (GRD) does have the responsibility. If we open dialogue with them to create an opportunity for them to actually capture some recharge credits, this would help them do their job. The development community pays a lot of money to GRD. Another item brought up was looking at special impact fees for developments and subdivisions as ways of helping the development community pay for some of the urbanization that requires flood control improvement dollars. That will not be required if development does not occur. I know there are a few topics we can brainstorm. Supervisor Wilcox thought we were going to have a joint working committee with BOS and the FCAB. There are a lot of potentially good ideas that can be followed up on.

*Ellegood:* Thank you for that reminder. We have talked about ground water recharge internally and have concluded at the staff level that it really is someone else's job to do that. We are not equipped or chartered to do recharge. We need to open a dialogue with the responsible agency and we will do that. Impact fees is part of our strategy to retain drainage administration. We have done this, most through in kind services in the past. We have also found that the development community can do things a lot cheaper, faster and more efficiently than we can. These were two good ideas that came out of the Joint Board Meeting.

*Cooper:* If we had an opportunity to discuss these items openly, we could come up with some action items for the staff to do.

*Martin:* I don't see why we can't put it on the agenda.

*Cooper:* I'm just asking for an opportunity for dialogue.

*Phillips:* Russ and I have talked about the Joint Retreat. There are really four items that came out of the meeting. Before we get too involved we want to make sure we do adequate staffing and bring you something to talk about. Behind the scenes there have been a number of discussions as how to solve the issues. We want to make sure we are prepared before we come forward to you.

*Ellegood:* I would like to make it a matter of record. Perhaps at the next meeting we can have an open discussion as an agenda item. I would like to ask Dick to make sure this is an agenda item and Alicia to make it a matter of record.

There was no other business or comments from the public.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45 p.m. by general consent.

---

Scott Ward  
Secretary of the Board

---

Alicia Robertson  
Clerk of the Board